

Appl. No. 10/678,522
Amdt. Dated Apr. 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 21, 2005

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 4, 8, and 11 are objected to because of the informalities set forth in this Office Action.

In regard to Claims objections, Claims 4, 8, and 9 are corrected to overcome objection of the informalities by appropriate correction.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

In response to Claim Rejections set forth in this Office Action, applicant has carefully amended claims 1, 3, 6-8 13-16 and 19 to be sufficient antecedent basis and clear to overcome the informality problems.

Amended Claim 3 has been amended to depend from dependent Claim 2 to recite the limitation "each space interval" which is described in amended Claim 2, so dependent claim 3 is believed to be sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Amended Claim 19 has been amended where "the main body" originally described is replaced by "the supporting plates". Since dependent Claim 19 depends from independent claim 18 recites the limitation "each space interval" which is described in the amended Claim 18, so dependent claim 19 is believed to be sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simpson et al. '672.

Appl. No. 10/678,522
Arndt. Dated Apr. 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 21, 2005

In regard to amended claim 1, a supporting plate for supporting substrates defined therein comprises a main body and two stiff shafts. The main body has a plurality of wing panels extending from the main body and two through grooves in a back side of the main body. The two stiff shafts are received in the two through grooves, and each wing panel comprises a plurality of protrusions extending from a free side of each wing panel, and **the wing panels slope down**.

Referring to Simpson et al. '672, the side wall assemblies 110 disclosed therein comprise a plurality of shelf members 150, each shelf member 150 has body portion 182 with an inwardly projecting shelf portion 180, **shelf portion 180 is canted slightly upward** from web portion to edge portion 184.

However, Claim 1 specifically point out that **the wing panels slope down, but not canted slightly upward** described as Simpson et al. '672. Apparently, the wing panels as designated in claim 1 are different from the shelf portions 180 as disclosed in Simpson et al. '672.

Therefore, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Simpson et al. '672.

Furthermore, in Simpson et al. '672, the shelf portion 180 of the shelf member 150 is canted slightly upward from web portion 186 to edge portion 184 (as described in the paragraph [0025] of the specification in conjunction with shown in FIGS. 4-7 in Simpson et al. '672). The upward cant of shelf portion 180 provides a continuous wafer contact surface 190 along the entire edge portion 184 of the shelf portion 180, in order to moving the area of support as far toward the center of the wafer as possible to minimize sagging of the wafer.

On the contrary, in claim 1, the wing panels slope down, are suitable for the requirement of only touching with the edge of the substrate inserted into the space

Appl. No. 10/678,522
Amdt. Dated Apr. 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 21, 2005

interval of the supporting plate. Hence, the function of the supporting plates with the structure disclosed therein are different from that disclosed in Simpson et al. '672.

Thereby, the claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Dependent Claims 2-5 are believed to patentable since they depend from independent claim 1.

In regard to amended Claim 8, a cassette defined therein comprises a pair of frames and a pair of supporting plates fixed to the frames, the pair of supporting plates face each other, each supporting plate comprises a main body and two stiff shafts, and the main body has a plurality of wing panels extending from an inward facing side of the main body and two through grooves in a back side of the main body. The two stiff shafts are received in the two through grooves, and each wing panel comprises a plurality of protrusions extending from a free side of each wing panel, and **the wing panels slope down**.

For the similar reasons as Claim 1, Claim 8 is also believed to be patentable.

Dependent Claims 9-12 are believed to patentable since they depend from independent claim 8.

In regard to amended Claim 17, a cassette defined therein comprises a pair of frames and a pair of supporting plates fixed to the frames, the pair of supporting plates face each other, and each supporting plate defines a plurality of wing panels on an inward facing side, each wing panel comprises a plurality of protrusions extending from a free side of each wing panel, and **the wing panels slope down**.

For the similar reasons as Claim 1, Claim 17 is also believed to be patentable.

Appl. No. 10/678,522
Amdt. Dated Apr. 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 21, 2005

Dependent Claims 18-19 are believed to patentable since they depend from independent claim 17.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 6, 7 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson et al.'672.

For the above reasons, Claims 1 and 8 is believed to be patentable. So dependent Claims 6-7 and 13-16 are believed to patentable since they depend from independent claims 1 and 8 respectively.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Huang et al.
By 
Wei Te Cheng

Registration No.: 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.
P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel No.: (408) 919-6137